



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK

JESSE F. STEINER

Director of Educational Service, American Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

V. THE CASE METHOD OF INSTRUCTION

The case method of instruction as it has been developed especially in schools of law and social work stands out as an important contribution to methods of professional education. The case method considered in its broadest sense is of course by no means limited to these two fields. Its underlying principles have long been the dominant factor in all scientific instruction. It is, in fact, simply the method of science which begins with the concrete fact instead of the general principle. In the field of the natural sciences, no other method would now be given serious consideration. Without the laboratory and the microscope and an opportunity for patient study of specimens and cases, the work of the scientist could not be successfully done. In the social sciences also, this inductive method of instruction has come to be regarded as a matter of course. There must first be the careful study of actual facts and conditions before generalization can begin. In this sense the case method is nothing more or less than the method of induction and as such takes its place in the wider movement of educational reform which in recent years has been so rapidly overthrowing traditional methods of instruction.

But in the more specific meaning of this term the case method applies more particularly to the type of instruction most common in schools of law and social work where the point of departure and the chief content of the course consist in the study and analysis of separate cases. Its origin as far as law schools are concerned goes back to the Harvard Law School in 1871, when Langdell threw aside the traditional textbooks and endeavored to teach the principles of law through a study of selected cases. This method, which at the time seemed so revolutionary, was based on the conviction that law is a science with its own data and body of experience which must be

studied as we do the material of any other science as it develops in concrete situations. In Langdell's opinion the student could be given a more systematic view of the principles of law and a clearer comprehension of their historical development by a study of cases, carefully selected and arranged, than by the customary deductive study of the principles themselves. The central feature of this method of instruction in law is the analysis of separate cases by the students for the purpose of disentangling the facts and bringing out the point of law involved. This task, whether performed independently by the students or carried out under the guidance of the teacher in classroom discussion, results not merely in giving a practical knowledge of law but trains the mind in methods of legal thinking.

The success of the case method of teaching law can be judged by the fact that it has become the general mode of instruction in the more prominent law schools in this country. It is indeed largely due to this method of instruction that the study of law in American universities has been placed upon a scientific basis comparable to that of other important fields of professional education.

In the schools of social work the case method is less widely known but is of equal importance. Its use in this field has been largely in connection with the teaching of the technique of case work. The apprentice in a case-work agency receives his first initiation to his duties through a study and analysis of case records taken from the files of the organization employing him. This study under the direction of a competent district secretary or supervisor and accompanied by actual work in the field under supervision has long been the central feature of the apprenticeship system of training in this type of social work.

The case method of instruction in schools of social work follows essentially the same lines. Carefully selected case histories rather than textbooks are relied upon for teaching material. The instructor of case work usually selects and edits or secures from some outside source a few records suitable for teaching purposes and builds up his course around a class discussion of the facts contained in these records and the points of technique illustrated by them. These records are not usually placed in the hands of the students,

at least in the beginning of the course of study. A common method is for the instructor to read them, paragraph by paragraph, in the classroom for the purpose of enabling the students to reconstruct in imagination the actual situation faced by the worker who handled the case and then decide between the alternative courses of action that present themselves at critical points of the record. By thus living through, as it were, the experience of the case worker and step by step working out the proper procedure to be followed, the student not only becomes familiar with the technique of case work, but obtains a real knowledge of the nature of social problems and of the social forces in the community that may be utilized in working out their solution.

The advantages of this method over that of a general discussion of social problems are obvious. The student who has thought through the experiences of a worker in his efforts over a period of months or years to re-establish a dependent family has an intimate insight into the problems of dependency that could not be obtained by any amount of general reading. When this class discussion of a case record under the guidance of a competent instructor is supplemented by a sufficient amount of field work to give the student actual experience in dealing with the problems under discussion in the classroom, it is difficult to conceive of a method of instruction better adapted to the needs of students preparing for professional work in this field.

One of the problems in the successful use of this method of instruction is that of securing the proper kind of teaching material. Case records, as has already been pointed out by Porter R. Lee,¹ have been prepared by organizations for their own use and not with the needs of students in mind. Their chief concern is with the actual steps that were taken and the results secured, whereas the student is interested primarily in how a particular course of action was decided upon and why it was chosen in preference to other alternatives. This calls for an analysis of the processes involved in handling the case which cannot easily be done because of the lack of sufficient data of the right kind in the record itself. Instructors using the

¹ "Preparation of Teaching Material," New Orleans Conference of Social Work, 1920.

case method sometimes overcome this difficulty by depending upon case records with which they have personal knowledge. Another plan is to secure the needed data through a personal conference with the person who handled the case and wrote the record.

As long, however, as lack of teaching material compels each instructor to be responsible for finding and editing the case records for his own use, the case method of instruction in social work must be regarded as far behind the achievements of the case method in law which for many years has had available a large number of carefully selected and well-edited cases. If the case method of teaching social work is to occupy its proper place as a method of professional education, it is of the utmost importance that teaching material of the right kind be made easily accessible.

Until very recently little attention had been paid to the preparation of teaching records for general use. One of the first and most significant attempts to meet this need was made by Miss Mary E. Richmond of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation. The records prepared under her direction were edited with great care and have proved invaluable to schools of social work and to supervisors of case work in charity organization societies. It is unfortunate that the records issued under these auspices have been few in number and that the restrictions placed upon their circulation have made them available to only a limited circle.

Another effort to supply this teaching material is being made by the American Red Cross. In order to provide case records suitable for use in its training courses, it has undertaken the preparation of a series of records designed to illustrate the most typical problems met with in dealing with disadvantaged individuals and families. Records are being secured from small towns and rural communities as well as from large cities and as far as possible from all sections of the country so that they may be fairly representative of general social conditions. A new feature of these records is the inclusion of all notes and suggestions for the teacher in a separate teacher's manual. In this manual the various steps taken in handling the case are analyzed and every effort is made to supply the data that would be of use to the teacher in classroom work.

The great need of teaching material of this kind would seem to justify the preparation of case books in social work that would be comparable to those that have been prepared for the use of law schools. There should be included in these case books not only the customary type of record designed chiefly for use in teaching the technique of case work; there should also be case histories intended to illustrate types of problems and results of treatment. Teachers of social work could very profitably use case records patterned somewhat after medical case histories, that give briefly the facts of diagnosis and treatment; or legal case records, that are used to illustrate principles of law rather than methods of legal procedure. Social case records of this kind may very well take the form of a summary of the history of the case. The essential thing is to have the facts stated in sufficient detail to give the student a clear understanding of the problem in its relation to the particular situation in which it occurs. Sufficient attention has not yet been given to the teaching value of such case summaries. Instructors usually rely upon detailed chronological records, one of which may be made the subject of class discussion for a considerable period of time. One of the dangers in a prolonged study of a few cases is that students may come to look upon them as pointing out the definite way in which particular problems should be handled. This danger could be largely overcome if a study of a detailed record dealing for example with the problem of desertion could be followed by a brief discussion of a number of case summaries illustrating the varied forms this problem assumed under different situations, and the kind of treatment given. It would be hard to find a better way in which to give the student a comprehensive grasp of the complex and ever-changing factors involved in social work.

Another type of case record for which there is a real need is that which would embody the experiences of those actively engaged in the various aspects of community organization. It is becoming increasingly evident that social workers must understand the technique of dealing with communities as well as with individuals and families. The adjustment of the social forces of a community so that the largest possible contribution will be made to the welfare

of all its members is a task which requires the services of a skilled leader. If training for this kind of community work is to be carried on effectively it ought to be possible to profit by the experience of community workers just as the experiences of case workers have been made use of in training for family work. Community case records (if we may use that term) should be as valuable in a course in community organization as are family case records in a course in methods of family case work. But here, also, the community record to be of real value for instruction in technique must be more than a chronological statement of work undertaken and results secured; it must analyze the steps that were taken at significant stages of the community work and indicate why any particular course has been chosen in preference to another. The underlying and not always easily recognized factors that determined the line of action must be given due attention. The usual type of survey report contains the information necessary to give a picture of the conditions that were studied but it throws only incidental light on the processes involved in making the survey. The student of social conditions is satisfied with the report if facts are secured; the student learning how to make a survey must have a supplemental statement dealing with the machinery that was used in getting the facts and preparing them for presentation. In a similar manner the student of the technique of community organization is interested not merely in the fact that a certain agency was established in a community; he wants to know why this agency in preference to any other was decided upon and the different steps by which its organization was accomplished.

The great difficulty at the present time is that few community records of this kind have been prepared and as a consequence it is not possible to compare methods and determine whether the technique in this field can be standardized as it has been in other lines of social work. Until more progress has been made in securing this type of community record, teaching material for courses in the technique of community organization must be regarded as entirely inadequate.

The case method of instruction in social work is pedagogically sound, and when a proper amount of teaching material is made

available it will doubtless come into still wider use. There is now a tendency in some schools of social work to demand a great deal of class discussion of different types of case records before permitting the students to engage in any field work except that of the simplest type. While this method of instruction can never take the place of field work, it may be possible when a sufficient amount of teaching material is available to have the study and discussion of written records supplement in a much larger way than is now customary the actual work of the students in the field.

VI. THE PLACE OF FIELD WORK IN THE COURSE OF STUDY

Education for social work, unlike engineering and medical education, has never passed through a didactic stage of instruction with chief emphasis upon theoretical studies. On the contrary, as might be expected in training schools that developed out of the apprentice system, field-work training has always been given a prominent place in the curriculum.

Because of the close relationship between the first schools of social work and the social agencies, the latter as a matter of course assumed responsibility for the field work of the students. While this plan involved the delegation of an important part of the instruction to persons not directly under control of the school it was felt that this was the most practical way of providing this training. Experience soon demonstrated, however, that field work carried on in this way could with great difficulty be made an integral part of the course. Too often it tended to become a kind of extra-mural requirement dominated more by the conditions existing in the agency than by the ideals of the school. The pressure of the work in the agency, coupled with the fact that those actually in charge of the practice work of the students were not always skilled or interested in teaching, frequently caused the students' practice to be limited to meaningless errand-running or to other detached tasks of very little educational value.

The existence of this difficulty has long been recognized and many efforts have been made to find a satisfactory solution. In some cases, the social agencies that have been co-operating with schools of social work set aside teaching districts in which they

make an effort to have workers specially qualified to supervise the field work of the students. The schools of social work on their part frequently give the field-work supervisors a nominal position on their faculty and by periodical conferences with these supervisors endeavor to bring about the proper correlation of the practical work with classroom instruction. In many instances the relationship between the schools of social work and the social agencies has been so close and cordial that the problem has been much simplified. The results attained by the schools of social work indicate that this traditional method of providing field-work training has in a considerable degree been successful. Whatever its failures, they have not been due to any lack of appreciation of educational ideals on the part of the executive heads of the social agencies. The chief difficulty has been to find members of their staff that have teaching ability and to arrange their work in such a way that they would have sufficient time to give careful supervision to the students.

This problem of the proper measure of control over field-work facilities is by no means peculiar to schools of social work. It is a fundamental problem in the whole field of professional education and has been met by the professional schools in different ways. In the field of medical education it is generally agreed that clinical experience cannot be provided in the most satisfactory way by a hospital or dispensary that is entirely detached from the medical school. If the hospital has the right to limit the wards or the types of cases to which the students may have access, or to determine the hours when clinical instruction may be given, or to set up any other restrictions that would interfere with a sound teaching policy, the medical school cannot build up a well-balanced curriculum that will meet the needs of the students. Experience has demonstrated that the school should have educational control of its clinical facilities, a control that involves not only the decision about teaching arrangements in the hospital, but the power to appoint the hospital staff.

Engineering schools, on the other hand, are finding it impracticable to depend upon their own schools for the practice work of their students. With their limited equipment it is impossible to

duplicate the varied processes carried on in industry and familiarize the students with actual working conditions. To instal and keep up-to-date the vast and complicated machinery of the engineering world and develop shops that would approximate the conditions as they exist in the varied lines of industry would mean a tremendous expense. The solution of their field-work problem that seems to be most successful is the so-called co-operative plan which sends the students into industrial plants on a paid basis for their practical work. This shopwork which alternates with classroom instruction is carefully graded and planned so as to fit into the curriculum, but it is real work that is not only of value to the students but to their employers as well. In order to make sure that the shopwork assigned to the students is being done in a way that would have educational value, shop co-ordinators are sent by the school to the shop where they inspect the work of the students and confer with those in charge of their work. The industrial world thus becomes the students' laboratory while the school assumes the function of interpreting this practical experience in terms of the theories and principles that underlie successful engineering practice.

Schools of law have never seriously grappled with the problem of field-work training. Their course of study is intended to acquaint students with the principles of law rather than with the technique of legal practice. Some attention is given to the latter in the moot courts common in some law schools, and law students are sometimes encouraged to get practice work with legal-aid societies or in law offices, but in general the acquirement of skill in the practice of law is regarded as something that should follow instead of form a part of the law course.

In the training of teachers, opportunities for students to teach under supervision have come to be regarded as a necessity. In some cases this is carried on by special arrangements with the public schools where the students have the advantage of familiarizing themselves with the routine of the schoolroom under actual working conditions. Another plan usually preferred by professional schools of education is to have these practice schools under the direct control of those responsible for the training of the teachers. It is very evident that this gives greater freedom in

working out experimental methods and makes it possible to have the proper control over those who supervise the practice work.

The experience, therefore, of professional schools in providing practical training facilities for their students has by no means followed the same lines. The administrative problems vary with the type of field work to such an extent that it may never be possible to work out uniform methods of procedure that would be applicable to all professional schools.

The important thing as far as schools of social work are concerned, is to keep clearly in mind the educational requirements of field-work training and then recognize that methods of fulfilling these requirements must be determined by local conditions and circumstances. The minimum requirements of field work stand out clearly in the definition formulated by the Committee on Field Work of the Association of Urban Universities at the annual meeting of this Association in New York in 1917. According to this committee, field work "includes the activities of students in the performance of tasks of everyday life under actual conditions which may be accepted and directly related to concurrent class work." The two most fundamental things that determine the educational value of field work are the participation in tasks under actual working conditions and the proper correlation of these tasks so that they fit into a systematic course of training. It is conceivable that these two requirements may be met by different methods of field-work administration. There is no inherent reason why a social agency that has been requested to furnish field-work training for students should not do this in a satisfactory manner. The acceptance of such responsibility is by no means incompatible with a sound administration of their work. As a matter of fact the giving of such training must be regarded as one of the regular duties of a well-equipped organization. If their personnel is sufficient and willing to co-operate with the school, students working under their direction ought to receive training of high quality.

On the other hand it should be possible for the schools of social work to build up training facilities under their own management and direction. A school properly equipped with field-work supervisors might very well choose suitably located communities where

some phase of social work was needed and develop in those communities activities in which the students could participate. The university schools of social work that are located in places where social agencies of high grade do not exist may find that the establishment of these training centers is the best method of providing certain kinds of field work for their students. Under the direction of a field-work supervisor a small group of students could make the first beginning of a training center in an unorganized community by making a study of its social needs and resources preparatory to a determination of the program of work that is to be undertaken. The different projects determined upon would then furnish training opportunities for succeeding classes working under the field supervisor who would accept responsibility for the work that was done. In order to avoid the gaps in the work caused by school vacations and to give the field supervisor necessary assistance in training the students, graduate fellowships could be provided which would carry with them the obligation to serve as assistants in the training center. It is probable that as this community work develops and the interest of the people is aroused the time will come when the community will desire to carry on its activities independent of the university. When this occurs, the university will have lost control of its training center, but will have available a social agency which will still offer opportunities to students for practice work.

Such university training centers would only in exceptional instances provide all the field-work training of students. In order to provide a well-rounded training the schools of social work ought to make it possible for students to familiarize themselves with the work of the best-equipped social agencies both public and private. The various social agencies would still be needed by the school, but they could be used as supplementary to the university training center. Much of the preliminary and fundamental training could be given by the school directly under its own auspices, while the different agencies would still be called upon to provide students with experience in specific types of work.

At the present time the development of these training centers under the direction of schools of social work is still in the experimental stage. The experience of the Red Cross in its

home-service institutes during and especially since the war is a good example of one of the attempts that has been made to give the school control over its field-work training. In several of the institutes held in the largest cities the home-service section provided the institute supervisors with a separate office and permitted them to choose from among the active cases those that seemed most desirable, from a teaching point of view, for the students to handle. For these cases the institute supervisors were given the same responsibility that would be given a district secretary and, since they had power to choose suitable cases and to limit the number they would attempt to handle, it was possible to give careful instruction in technique and to insist upon thoroughgoing work in a way that could hardly have been done by the Home Service Section itself with its heavy pressure of work and frequently inadequate staff. In those sections of the country where high social-work standards had not yet been attained a modification of this same method made it possible to give the students good field-work training. During the period of the Institute, the Institute supervisors would be placed practically in charge of one or more Home Service offices in small cities or towns, thus giving them an opportunity personally to give the students good instruction in case work and office routine regardless of what may have been the standards of those offices prior to the holding of the training course.

While this plan for Home Service training involved obvious administrative problems and owed a considerable measure of its success to the co-operative spirit growing out of the war situation it at least indicates how the school's control of its training facilities helps to overcome the handicap of lack of access to well-equipped social agencies. If schools of social work are located near communities where social problems exist in sufficient variety, and maintain a staff of competent field-work supervisors, there is no reason why they should not be able to develop the training facilities they need. This assumption by the school of social work of greater responsibility for the students' field-work training is in accord with sound teaching policy and marks out a method of procedure which seems likely to be more generally followed in the future.

Another important problem of field-work training is how to bring about its proper correlation with the classroom instruction. At what time in the course should field work begin? Can field work be carried on satisfactorily by students whose time is partly occupied by classroom lectures and study? Is it possible to plan the practice work with the social agencies so that it will run parallel with the courses of instruction given at the school?

The general attitude of the schools of social work to this fundamental problem has been that field work must be carried on concurrently with classroom instruction. The first important challenge to this point of view was made by the Smith College Training School for Social Work which was established in 1918. In a recent bulletin of this School its position in regard to the place of field work in the curriculum is set forth and defended as follows:

The Smith College Training School for Social Work is a graduate professional school offering work that falls into three divisions: a summer session of eight weeks of theoretical instruction, combined with clinical observation; a training period of nine months' practical instruction carried on in co-operation with hospitals and settlements; and a concluding summer session of eight weeks of advanced study. . . .

The method of continuous practice is believed by the sponsors of the school to afford the best practical training. To become completely assimilated into the organization, the student must give full time to the work. To obtain the richest possible experience, the student should be on duty regularly and without interruption. In our opinion, practice work with social cases and social conditions can not be carried on satisfactorily with intensive instruction, since it is not possible to regulate human problems, so that experience will run parallel with theoretical instruction. There is great value for drill and discipline as well as depth of experience in the uninterrupted practice and in the continuity of theoretical study which the present plan provides.

While this abrupt departure from traditional methods was doubtless influenced somewhat by the fact that the location of the school in a small town made the usual type of field work not readily accessible, the experiment is of sufficient significance to deserve careful attention. Whatever one may think of the solution arrived at, it represents an effort to escape the difficulties faced by those who insist that field-work and classroom instruction must always go hand in hand. Because of the complex nature of

the social problems dealt with, it is by no means easy to assign the students definite tasks that will illustrate step by step the subjects discussed in the different courses. And unless correlation of the field work and classroom work is achieved to this extent there is a tendency to regard them as two separate activities, each invaluable but only in a limited measure fitting into a unified program. As a matter of fact, since field work brings the students face to face with social problems of absorbing interest that demand an immediate solution and that direct attention to methods applicable to a particular situation, students are more likely to underestimate the value of wider study of the whole problem than to regard this field work as an interpretation of the problems that have already been discussed in the classroom.

Furthermore, the ten or fifteen hours a week that it is possible to give to field work when carried on concurrently with class work are hardly sufficient to enable the student to do much constructive work. The agency in which the student is working is compelled to assign tasks that can be completed in the limited time available. Very important types of field work may need to be omitted entirely because they require consecutive effort which the student cannot give. When the student's time is divided between field work and classroom lectures and assigned readings, it becomes a difficult problem for him to feel himself a part of the social agency to which he is assigned and to have a sense of responsibility for the work undertaken.

The existence of these difficulties in the way of concurrent field and class work has been recognized by the schools of social work, but thus far the Smith College Training School is the only one that has attempted such a radical solution. Several schools of social work have gone to the length of marking out definite blocks of time covering one or more weeks which are devoted to uninterrupted field work. Such an arrangement is of real value in learning technique, and provision ought always to be made for such practice periods during the course of study. The Smith College plan, however, goes much farther than this and is open to the serious criticism that it places classroom instruction and field work in separate compartments which have only in a remote

way any vital relation to each other. Field work of certain kinds may be incompatible with class instruction and intensive study if carried on concurrently, and field work designed for certain purposes may very well be segregated in a way that will give an opportunity for continuous practice, but this does not justify the failure to accompany the class instruction with appropriate kinds of field work that would give the students first-hand knowledge of social problems and of the methods most commonly used in dealing with them.

It will probably take a great deal more careful study and experimentation before a satisfactory decision is reached in regard to these fundamental field-work problems. Doubtless considerable confusion has been caused by the tendency to regard field work as primarily practice work with a social agency for the purpose of learning technique, instead of thinking of it in its broader meaning as including, in addition to the practice work, participation in social research and investigation and working on problems designed to illustrate the principles discussed in the classroom.

Technical courses of instruction ought always to be accompanied by their appropriate field work, regarded as an inseparable part of the course and supervised by those who are familiar with the content of the class instruction. Field work of this kind carried on concurrently with class instruction need not have as its chief purpose the acquirement of skill through work experience. It may even be questioned whether students ought to be expected to gain their technique in this piecemeal fashion. This part of their training may possibly be carried out more satisfactorily by uninterrupted practice work under conditions that would familiarize them with office routine and compel them to accept responsibility for the work assigned them. The field work that should accompany class instruction should be planned with direct reference to the content of the course. Its purpose is similar to that of the field work in a course in botany or geology or any other scientific study. To be of educational value it must fit step by step into the subject-matter of the course and for this reason cannot readily be relegated to a social agency. It has been the failure to work out this close correlation

between the class instruction and the field work that has brought about the unfortunate and illogical distinction between theoretical courses and practical work.

Courses of study worthy of a place in a professional school ought to be theoretical only in the sense that all work whether done in class or in the field seeks to test out theories and formulate principles and devise methods for the purpose of attaining increasingly better results. Field work is one part of the process by which these results are achieved. Its contribution, however, cannot be best made by simply delegating to it the burden of providing the practical side of the training of social workers. As long as we hold to this idea of field work, we have made little progress beyond the apprenticeship stage of training. Education for social work should be carried on by means of courses that include field work designed to make their subject-matter vital and concrete and of such a nature that this field work is not inconsistent with intensive and thorough study.

In this connection it is well to remind ourselves that the graduates of a school for social work cannot be expected to have acquired the technical skill that comes only through long practice. Much of the confusion in regard to the place of field work in the curriculum has been caused by the tendency to give technique an emphasis inconsistent with adequate attention to other aspects of professional training. A study of the curriculum of schools of social work leaves the impression that in spite of the advance made within recent years, they still follow out closely the methods of apprentice training. The field work that is given a central place in the curriculum from the beginning to the end of the course of study is primarily practice work with social agencies for the purpose of gaining familiarity with their technique and methods of work.

In arriving at a critical estimate of this method of training, help can be gained by reference to the procedure in medical education which has so much in common with education for social work. The medical school arranges its courses of study in four main divisions and gives them in the following order: (1) physiology, (2) pathology, (3) therapeutics, (4) hospital experience. In the first part of the course emphasis is placed upon a knowledge of the structure

and functions of the human body, followed by a study of its diseases and abnormalities. In order to do this adequately, the appropriate sciences are called into requisition and the laboratory is extensively used. It is only in the latter part of the course that the student is expected to devote much time to clinical experience. By means of this clinical study and practice the student gains familiarity with the methods followed in the diagnosis and treatment of disease and with the procedure of the operating room, but this is not regarded as sufficient equipment for successful practice. His graduation from the medical school is supposed to be followed by a year of hospital experience where, under the most favorable auspices, he can devote his whole time to the practice of his profession.

Education in social work should also proceed in this orderly and logical way. Beginning with a study of the structure and functions of society, with emphasis upon social research, the students should be led gradually into the field of social pathology, where they will study the methods of dealing with problems arising out of social maladjustments and abnormal conditions. Here the clinical field work may well begin, and no more should be expected of it than is expected of the clinics attended by the medical student. Familiarity should be gained with methods of social diagnosis and treatment and there should be opportunity for a limited amount of practice with the routine work of different kinds of social agencies. But the acquirement of skill that comes through considerable work experience must be left to the social-work internship that should follow the course of study offered by a school of social work. Only in exceptional cases should the graduate of a school of social work be considered ready for a position of independent responsibility. It should become as common as it now is in the medical profession for the social-work graduate to undergo an apprenticeship of varying length in his chosen field where under favorable conditions he can acquire professional skill. When this comes to be regarded as the accepted procedure to follow, it will be possible to give field work its proper place in the course of study and to plan a more thoroughgoing training course than can now be done.

[To be continued]